

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 remain in this application. Claims 1, 9 and 17-19 have been rejected. The Examiner has indicated that claims 2- 8, 10-16 and 20-24 would be allowable if in independent form. Applicants appreciate this indication of allowability, but have not amended these claims, since, for the reasons set out in detail below, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 as anticipated by Kubo et al. (hereinafter Kubo). In the portions of the specification cited by the Examiner, particularly those at columns 12-14, an eight times over-sampling takes place. Four of the eight samples are provided to the four blind equalizers. First this is done with equal spacing as shown in Fig. 7, but as reliability is determined, the particular samples sent to the equalizers are changed as shown in subsequent figures. The Examiner does not say exactly how he finds the reference to anticipate claim 1.

Looking to see how the disclosure of this reference fits the claim, it becomes immediately clear that there is no anticipation. Over-sampling is done and  $n=8$  samples are obtained. However, Applicants see no indication of  $m$  groups of these  $n$  samples being stored. Rather, only the  $n$  samples are stored. Nor are  $m$  groups of  $n$  samples output. What are output are four of the eight samples or  $n/2$  samples. Even if it can be said that in groups of the  $n$  samples are obtained and stored, this is not enough. Such groups of  $n$  samples, even if more than one set is stored, are never all output at the same time. In the disclosed embodiment of the claimed invention, for example, 5 ( $m$ ) groups of 8 ( $n$ ) samples are obtained, stored and then all forty ( $m$  groups of  $n$ ) output simultaneously. In the reference, irrespective of how many groups of 8 ( $n$ ) samples are obtained, only 4 ( $n/2$ ) are output at any one time. Thus, it is clear that claim 1 is not anticipated by Kubo. The remaining rejections based on obviousness are all rely on the same misinterpretation of Kubo. Thus, these claims are also allowable. Nothing in the patent to Jeong makes up for the deficiency in Kubo in regard to the basic limitation of storing  $m$  groups of  $n$  samples and outputting them simultaneously.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that all claims clearly distinguish over the art and are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 220-4200 to discuss any information concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,



---

John C. Altmiller  
Registration No. 25,951

Date: September 7, 2004

KENYON & KENYON  
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel.: (202) 220-4200  
Fax.: (202) 220-4201  
499730\_1.DOC/jeb